



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_48409
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional and Phytochemical Characteristics of CaesalpinioideaeSeeds
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Title must be: "Chemical composition of Caesalpinioideae seeds" Otherwise the paper is premature as work done.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Major revision in title and writing Specific points; 1.Total polyphenol content of kernel 1820 ± 32 , mg/kg = 1.8g/1000g=0.18% Total polyphenol content seed coat= 28200 ± 540 mg/1000gms or 28g/1000g =2.8% So $2.8/0.18=15.5$ times. Give reason for that. Brown colour chemistry must be given. Assay the antioxidant, antibacterial, antifungal and anticancer activities.</p> <p>2.You claim it has Cd and Pb. Then even it has Mg, Co, Fe, it is poor nutritional.</p> <p>3. You have to purify phytochemicals further by TLC and HPLC, then only you can do FT-IR.</p> <p>4. Protein content in kernel?</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper is premature work unless the title has changed</p> <p>"Nutritional and phytochemical characteristics of Caesalpinioideae seeds" is very early study and need more work to publish. It is not well thought work. However, the paper could be accepted by heading "Chemical composition of Caesalpinioideae seeds"</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asit Kumar Chakraborty
Department, University & Country	Oriental Institute of Science and Technology , India